

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on March 17, 2008, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 14-18, 23-25, 30, 33, 36, and 37 are amended, claims 13, 31, and 32 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-8, 12, 14-18, 23-25, 30, and 33-37 are now pending in this application.

35 USC § 101 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is indicated to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. The preamble of claim 36 has been amended as suggested in the office action. Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome by amendment. Although not rejected under 35 USC § 101, independent claim 23 has been similarly amended.

35 USC § 112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-7, 8, 12-18 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 23, the office action states that claims 1 and 23 are indefinite because it is unclear as to what kind of information and/or device will the notebook synchronize its “information in a personal information manager” with. Claim 1 has been amended to recite “communicating with the notebook computer ... to cause the notebook computer to send email ... having been previously composed and stored on the notebook computer.” Claim 1 as amended clarifies the “information” as email to be sent, and removes the term “information in a personal information manager”. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this rejection with respect to claims 1 and 23 has been overcome by amendment and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-7 and 23-25 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 8, the office action states that claim 8 is indefinite because the limitation “synchronizing information in a personal information manager” does not correlate with other limitations. Claim 8 has been amended to clarify the interaction between a portable computer and a handheld WPAN enabled device. In addition, the preamble of claim 8 has been amended to recite “a method of synchronizing information in a portable computer with information in a corporate network server”. Applicants respectfully submit that the type of information to be synchronized is not a limitation of the invention as embodied by claim 8. Applicants believe that this rejection with respect to claim 8 has been overcome by amendment and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8, 12, and 14-18 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 30-37 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orava (U.S. Patent No. 6,829,288) in view of Loughran et al. (U.S. Publication Application No. 2002/0129107). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed invention.

The Orava Reference

The Orava reference discloses a wireless device that simultaneously supports multiple wireless protocol versions. See the Abstract, lines 13-19. The bulk of the Orava reference describes a wireless device with two correlators to simultaneously correlate access codes of incoming data packets against access code fields associated with plural protocol versions. See, for example, FIGs 3-8; column 4, line 57 to column 5, line 17; and column 11, line 53 to column 12, line 36.

In the background section, while discussing general Bluetooth principles, the Orava reference also states at column 3, lines 60-67:

For example, with Bluetooth, a person could synchronize one's phone with a PC without taking the phone out of one's pocket or briefcase. The users

would automatically *receive E-Mail on their notebook or laptop computers by the digital cellular phones in their pockets* or synchronize their primary PC with their hand-held computer without taking it out of their briefcase. [Emphasis Added].

The above-cited portion of Orava describes using the Bluetooth (WPAN) channel as the conduit for the E-mail to reach the notebook or laptop computer from the digital cellular phone. This is well known in the art as dial-up networking (DUN), where the digital cellular phone operates as a modem and provides connectivity to the notebook computer via a Bluetooth connection.

Applicants note that Orava does not describe a notebook or laptop computer coupled to a network other than the Bluetooth (WPAN) network, and also does not describe the claimed interaction over a WPAN to cause the notebook or laptop computer to download email over a network other than the Bluetooth (WPAN) network.

The Loughran Reference

The Loughran reference describes a server alerting a GSM device that email has been received. See the Abstract. The GSM device may be part of a notebook computer or may be part of a cellular phone. See FIG. 1. To retrieve the email, the server sends the email over the GSM network. See FIG. 2. In the description of Loughran, the email notification and the download of the email both occur over the GSM network whether the GSM device is part of the notebook or the phone. Accordingly, similar to Orava, Loughran does not describe the claimed interaction over a WPAN to cause the notebook computer to download email over a network other than the WPAN.

The office action cites paragraph 0039-0042 in support of the statement that the “laptop would then dial the ISP, connect to the mail-server and download the email”. Applicants respectfully submit that a close reading of paragraphs 0039-0042 with reference to FIG. 2 reveals that Loughram only anticipates using the GSM link for dialing the ISP.

Combining Orava and Loughran produces a system which utilizes the mobile device as a modem. If the mobile device and the notebook computer are coupled via a WPAN, then the email transfer occurs over the WPAN. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Orava and Loughran do not teach “communicating with a notebook computer over a wireless personal area network (WPAN) to cause the notebook computer to download email over a network other than the WPAN” as alleged in the office action. Accordingly, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented.

Additionally, the office action states at the bottom of page 4 that “[o]ne skill in the art would recognize the advantage of having a Bluetooth-enabled device such as a cellular phone, a PDA, etc. connects to a laptop computer so that the laptop could remotely initiate a download of e-mail from an e-mail server whenever it is notified.” Applicants submit that impermissible hindsight must be utilized to arrive at this conclusion at least to the extent that the laptop initiates a download of email using other than the Bluetooth-enabled device. The cited references do not disclose initiating a download of email using other than the Bluetooth-enabled device.

The above traversal notwithstanding, applicants have amended independent claims 30, 33, and 36 to clearly recite the interaction between a WPAN-enabled device and a notebook computer. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment further defines over the references of record.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD A. FORAND ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 45445

Telephone Number: 952-473-8800

Date June 17, 2008

By /Dana B. LeMoine/
Dana B. LeMoine
Reg. No. 40,062